

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Claims 1–11, 16–28, and 33–36 remain pending for examination.

By this Amendment, Claims 12–15 and 29–32, which were previously withdrawn in response to the Restriction Requirement of September 22, 2004, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for indefiniteness. Therefore, Claim 6 is currently amended to eliminate any antecedent basis problems that may have existed therein. Claim 5 is similarly amended, since Claims 5 and 6 were similarly structured, as originally filed. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

Claims 1–9, 16, 20–26, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Diffie, *et al.* (U.S. Patent 5,371,794; hereafter “Diffie”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and further requests that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, particularly in view of the current amendments to independent Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, and 33, from which the remainder of the presently rejected claims depends, have been presently amended.

Specifically, Claims 1 and 21 are currently amended to recite, in part:

establishing access to the computing resource using authorization information obtained from the authenticator to reflect a relative security level for a user of the mobile computing unit, the authorization information corresponding to the authenticated identity of the mobile computing unit.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Diffie does not teach or suggest authorization information to reflect a relative security level for a user of the mobile computing unit, nor does the rejection advance any argument to that effect.

Claim 16 is currently amended to recite, in part:

receiving an address for sending and receiving data to and from the computing resource, the address corresponding to limited access to the computing resource based on the asserted identity.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Diffie does not teach or suggest an address being received based on the asserted identity of the user, nor does the rejection advance any argument to that effect. Claim 33 has been similarly amended to recite the feature underlined above with regard to Claim 16.

Claim 20 is currently amended to recite, in part:

generating an initial encryption key for encrypting communications over the secure link from the information in the certificate based on a relative security level accorded to the asserted identity.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Diffie does not teach or suggest an encryption key being generated based on a relative security level accorded to the asserted identity of the user, nor is any such argument advanced by the rejection.

Therefore, in view of the current substantive amendments to the claims, all of which are supported within the detailed description of the subject application, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently rejected claims are patentably distinguishable over Diffie. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 10, 11, 17–19, 27, 28, and 34–36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Diffie in view of Ramasubramani, *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,233,577; hereafter “Ramasubramani”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as well, and further requests that this rejection also be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the current amendments to independent Claims 1, 16, 20, 21, and 33, from which all of the presently rejected claims depend, it is respectfully submitted that the Diffie is fundamentally deficient in relation to the presently rejected claims. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Ramasubramani does not compensate for the deficiencies of Diffie, which are described above with regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), in relation to the independent claims. Therefore, the proposed combination of Diffie and Ramasubramani fails to render the


presently rejected claims obvious, and thus the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn.

The remaining references of record have been considered. It is respectfully submitted that they do not compensate for the deficiencies of the references utilized in rejecting the pending claims, particularly in view of the current amendments to the claims.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early and forthright issuance of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Dated: March 11, 2005



David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
(425) 703-8092

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052
USA